REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 17, 21, 23, and 27 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,730 (Hosain) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,774,797 (Freathy). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1, 17, and 23.

Hosain discloses a "system and method for temporary or permanent disabling of a cellular control device." (Hosain abstract) Hosain specifically teaches an "RF module used to implement elements of the system and method." (Hosain column 4, lines 16-17 referring to FIG. 3). "The RF module includes a cellular transceiver unit for transmitting and receiving packetized data over cellular control channels." (Hosain column 4, lines 17-20) Furthermore, FIG. 3 in Hosain also describes a processor that "controls the RF module and executes cellular processing instructions/logic." (Hosain column 4, lines 22-24)

Freathy discloses a "a tracking tag worn by an individual which cooperates with a monitoring center to monitor the location of individuals." (Freathy abstract)

With respect to independent claim 1 in the presently claimed invention, Applicant teaches and claims:

> "A method, comprising sending a message on a wireless network to a mobile computer, if the mobile computer receives the message, the mobile computer sending a confirmation that the message

was received to the message sender, and disabling the mobile computer, *and if the message sender does not receive the acknowledgement, the message sender queuing the message, checking the wireless network for the reconnectivity of the mobile computer to the network,* and sending the queued message to the mobile computer upon the mobile computer reconnecting to the network." (Claim 1) (Emphasis added)

In the Examiner's office action mailed on April 3, 2007, the Examiner equates the emphasized claim limitation as shown above with column 13, lines 43-67 in Hosain. Applicant respectfully submits that Hosain does not teach *the message sender... checking the wireless network for the reconnectivity of the mobile computer to the network* in column 13, lines 43-67 or in any other location. Applicant's **message sender** is an entity/device/etc. that is entirely separate and apart from the mobile computer being locked down. The support for this is clearly shown throughout Applicant's entire specification.

On the other hand, Hosain does not describe the **message sender** checking the wireless network for the reconnectivity of the mobile computer to the network. Although, the Examiner points to column 13, lines 43-67 as the location in Hosain that specifically teaches this point, no where in that referenced location or anywhere else in the Hosain specification does Hosain describe the **message sender** performing this task. Rather, column 13, lines 43-67 in Hosain to only indicates operations that the mobile device performs. Additionally, Freathy does not teach any methodology regarding *the message sender... checking the wireless network for the reconnectivity of the mobile*

computer to the network. Thus, Hosain and Freathy, each taken alone, or in combination, at least do not teach *the message sender... checking the wireless network for the reconnectivity of the mobile computer to the network.* Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Hosain and Freathy, each taken alone, or in combination, do not render independent claim 1 as obvious.

Furthermore, because the Examiner has failed to address or even mention the reason why it would be obvious to combine Hosain and Freathy in light of Applicant's argument to the contrary in Applicant's response to the previous Office Action mailed to the Examiner on December 26, 2006, Applicant is restating that argument below.

Applicant submits that Hosain and Freathy would not be obvious to combine. The Examiner has stated on page 3 of the office action mailed on April 3, 2007 that Freathy teaches a form of queuing the message, specifically Freathy column 6, lines 45-53. That particular section of Freathy states the following:

"At the end of the sleep period, the wireless modem will wake and send a wake message to the monitoring center. The monitoring center will know that the tag has been in sleep mode and is now in wake mode. The monitoring center can then repeat any necessary and/or unanswered messages. The wireless modem will check for messages and process any messages. Once all messages have been processed, the tag can automatically return to sleep mode for the predefined period of time." (Freathy column 6, lines 45-53) Freathy's method specifically teaches the wireless device initiating contact with the monitoring center upon entering wake mode. It would be detrimental to the security of Applicant's presently claimed invention to utilize Freathy's requirement of

an active acknowledgement directly to the message center. This is even more troubling when considering the mobile computer's security and functionality may be compromised.

As stated above, independent claim 1 claims in part "*if the message sender does not receive the acknowledgement, the message sender queuing the message, checking the wireless network for the reconnectivity of the mobile computer to the network, and sending the queued message to the mobile computer upon the mobile computer reconnecting to the network.*" The method in Freathy requires the wireless modem within the mobile computer device to actively send a wake message to the monitoring center (i.e. the sender). On the other hand, Applicant's mobile computer just needs to establish a connection to the wireless network and does not require any proactive management of communicating with the message center.

Rather, the message sender in Applicant's method checks for reconnectivity of the mobile computer to the general network and sends the message upon seeing the connection. Applicant's method also does not require the mobile computer to proactively check a message center for messages after it establishes contact. Again, rather, Applicant's sender sends the message upon seeing the connection established regardless of what the mobile computer is doing. This is dissimilar to Freathy. The method in Freathy requires the mobile computer to contain additional logic associated with proactively contacting the message center instead of the message center checking for connectivity of the mobile computer to the network. The method in Freathy also requires the mobile computer to proactively check for messages, such as a disabling message sent to the mobile computer. Applicant's method as claimed in claim 1 specifically has the logic associated with those processes contained within the sender.

By combining Hosain and Freathy, additional burdensome logic in the mobile computer would be required, which would discourage combining the two inventions in regard to Applicant's presently claimed invention. Applicant's mobile computer removes this unnecessary logic and allows for a more robust disabling algorithm when considering the mobile computer may be compromised. Freathy does not allow this robust disabling algorithm because of Freathy's mobile computer requires an active acknowledgement regarding communication directly from the mobile computer to the message center for initiation. Thus, for all of these reasons, it would not be obvious to combine the method in Freathy with Hosain to render Applicant's presently claimed invention obvious.

Even in the event that Hosain and Freathy are combined, Hosain and Freathy in combination do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention for the reasons set forth above regarding the **message sender**. Applicant further submits that Hosain and Freathy, each taken alone or in combination, do not render independent claims 17 and 23 obvious for the same reasons as independent claim 1.

Furthermore, claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 21, and 27 are dependent upon independent claims 1, 17, and 23 respectively. Therefore, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant submits that Hosain, and Freathy each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 21, and 27. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 17, 21, 23, and 27.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, and 28 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,730 (Hosain) and U.S. Patent No. 6,774,797 (Freathy) as applied to claims 1, 17, and 23 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,741,851 (Lee).

Lee discloses a "method for protecting data stored in a lost mobile terminal and a recording medium for storing the data are provided." (Lee abstract) The method includes utilizing an unreadable data request for making stored data unreadable and/or a data removal request for deleting stored data. (Lee, column 4, lines 45-47). Other methods for making stored data unreadable include hashing and mapping stored data onto null characters , making the input/output function of a portable telephone inoperable, or completely removing stored data (Lee, column 4, lines 49-52).

Claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, and 28 are dependent upon independent claims 1, 17, and 23 respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant respectfully submits that Hosain, Freathy, and Lee, each taken alone or in combination, do not render these dependent claims obvious. Thus, because Hosain, Freathy, and Lee, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, and 28, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, and 28.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 16, 19, and 25 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,730 (Hosain) and U.S. Patent No. 6,774,797 (Freathy) in view of and US Patent Application No. 2003/0199267 (Iwasa).

Iwasa discloses an information processing apparatus equipped multiple communication modules that are wirelessly linked. The apparatus can keep an OS from starting if a password is not entered. (Iwasa abstract)

Claims 3, 16, 19, and 25 are dependent upon independent claims 1, 17, and 23 respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant respectfully submits that Hosain, Freathy, and Iwasa, each taken alone or in combination, do not render these dependent claims obvious. Thus, because Hosain, Freathy, and Iwasa, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 3, 16, 19, and 25, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 3, 16, 19, and 25.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,730 (Hosain) and U.S. Patent No. 6,774,797 (Freathy) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of and US Patent No. 6,757,531 (Haaramo).

Haaramo discloses a method for voice based communication between a number of mobile terminals of a telecommunication network. The method includes steps of creating a group of terminals and storing group information in each of the terminals. Additionally, the method includes recording a voice message in one terminal, dispatching that message to the other terminals, and receiving the message at the other terminals. (Haaramo abstract)

Claims 7, 14, and 15 are dependent upon independent claims 1, 17, and 23 respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to

independent claims 1, 17, and 23, Applicant respectfully submits that Hosain, Freathy, and Haaramo, each taken alone or in combination, do not render these dependent claims obvious. Thus, because Hosain, Freathy, and Haaramo, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 7, 14, and 15, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 7, 14, and 15.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 50-0221. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Derek J. Reynolds at (916) 356-5374.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 2, 2007

/Derek J. Reynolds/
Derek J. Reynolds
Reg. No.: 60,104

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(916)356-5358